

[18th December 1922]

*Extent of cultivation in Government villages under the river Sarada.*

556 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the extent of wet cultivation including jirayati and inam lands in Government villages under the river Sarada, Vizagapatam district?

A.—The ayacut is 14,823 acres. Figures of cultivation are not available.

*Communal representation in the Anantapur Collectorate.*

557 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that the treasury deputy collector, magisterial clerk, darkhast clerk, abkari clerk and appointment clerk are all Brahmans in the Anantapur Collectorate; and

(2) whether it is a fact that one Balagurunatham Pillai, B.A., who has been acting for six months as tahsildar, has been replaced by a Brahman gentleman who has been only a sub-magistrate?

A.—(1) The present treasury deputy collector is a Brahman. As regards others, the Government have no information.

(2) The Government have no information.

*Mr. M. Rajam Nayudu, Private Secretary to the Raja of Ramnad.*

558 Q.—Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that one Mr. M. Rajam Nayudu, Private Secretary to the Raja of Ramnad and President of the Ramnad taluk board, is a member of the Ramnad district board also; and

(b) if so, whether it does not contravene the provisions of the Local Boards Act in that the Raja of Ramnad, the President of the district board of Ramnad, and his paid servant Mr. M. Rajam Nayudu are both members of the same district board?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The answer is in the negative.

*The lower division clerks of the Secretariat.*

559 Q.—Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state whether it is a fact—

(a) that the lower division clerks in the Secretariat, whose initial pay in the time-scale has been fixed at Rs. 40, have to remain in the same pay for about three years; and

(b) that their previous permanent and acting service on a salary equal to their starting pay in the time-scale is not taken into consideration for purposes of increment?

A.—(a) The scale of pay fixed for lower division clerks in the Secretariat is Rs. 40—40—5—65—3—80.

18th December 1922]

- (b) The rules applied throughout the Presidency in fixing the initial pay of present incumbents in the new time-scales were as follows :—

“Existing incumbents will ordinarily enter the time-scales at the stage next above the lowest rate of salary per mensem drawn by them on any date within a period of three months prior to 1st March 1921 or their temporary pay on 28th February 1921, if that is greater, provided that, if such salary or temporary pay represents any definite stage in the new scale, they should start at that stage. The term ‘salary’ includes substantive pay, temporary increase thereon . . . acting allowance and personal allowance, if any.

“When initial pay has been fixed according to the foregoing rules, the individual concerned will be considered to have entered the appropriate stage of the time-scale on 1st March 1921 and will be eligible for the next increment, if any, in the time-scale only after the expiry of the full period of stay provided for in the stage concerned.”

*Imprisonment of Messrs. Kaleswara Rao and Seshiah of Bezwada.*

560 Q.—Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU : Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao and Mr. A. V. G. R. Seshiah of Bezwada were charged by the police in Mis. Case No. 6/22 before the Additional Magistrate, Bezwada, under section 107 of the Criminal Procedure Code and whether the said Magistrate directed them to furnish security for Rs. 500 each and that on their refusal to furnish such security, the accused are now undergoing simple imprisonment for one year;

(2) whether the Magistrate has directed the above accused to furnish security on the ground that the accused “not only advocated non-payment of the municipal taxes in their speeches at the meetings referred to, but also got the fact published by beat of tom-tom on more than one occasion and that the existing municipal council has been constituted by Government in the due exercise of its powers, and the only remedy for any grievances consists in a proper constitutional agitation for its redress, and that the action of the accused tends to the dislocation of the present machinery of the municipality resulting in a breach of the peace or the disturbance of public tranquillity;”

(3) whether the Government have issued any instructions that those who carry on any agitation for the rectification of municipal grievances should be bound down to keep the peace; and

(4) whether there has been an inordinate delay in the reconstitution of the Bezwada municipal council under the Municipal Act of 1920 and whether considerable dissatisfaction existed and exists at Bezwada in regard to the action of the Government in postponing from time to time the elections to the municipal council and whether the accused took part in an agitation intended to draw the attention of the Government to the state of the municipal administration of Bezwada?